## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-19 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Fig. 2 and claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 13 have been amended, and claims 6 and 11 have been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

An Information Disclosure Statement with Form PTO-1449 was filed in the above-captioned patent application on January 4, 2002. Applicant has not yet received from the Examiner a copy of the Form PTO-1449 initialed to acknowledge the fact that the Examiner has considered the disclosed information. The Examiner is requested to initial and return to the undersigned a copy of the Form PTO-1449. For the convenience of the Examiner, a copy of that form along with the PTO date-stamped receipt evidencing the submission is attached. The application identified in the IDS now has issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,630,863. The Examiner could, as an alternative, make the 863 patent of record.

The Examiner also is requested to consider the Information Disclosure Statement filed April 8, 2004.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners
Liu and Chow during the May 24, 2004 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of
the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

Applicant submits a revised Fig. 2 to correct minor informalities in the originally filed Fig. 2. In particular, Fig. 2 has been revised to correctly identify MV1 and MV3, as the reference characters had been reversed. Support for the amendment can at least be found on page 22 of the specification. Acknowledgement of revised Fig. 2 is respectfully requested.

As discussed during the personal interview, claim 6 was not rejected based on any of the references of record. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 6, which depends from claim 1 contains allowable subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate



that claim 1 and claims 2-4, 8, 9, 14 and 17, which depend from amended claim 1, are allowable.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable by over U.S. Patent No. 6,426,594 issued to Ito, and claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ito. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above and during the personal interview, Applicant submits that the features previously recited in canceled claim 6, which have been incorporated into claim 1 are not disclosed by Ito. Further, Applicant submits that Ito in fact teaches away from having at least seven driving voltage levels because the general object of the invention disclosed in Ito is to reduce the number of driving voltage levels (col. 4, lines 47-59). For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Ito fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1, as well as all the features of claims 2 and 14, which depend from claim 1.

Claim 5 was amended to incorporate the features of original claim 1. Page 3 of the Office Action states that Figure 16 of Ito discloses a multi-potential generator which generates an intermediate voltage between the three reference voltage supply lines, and the intermediate voltages are created through resistive division and fed through the op amp. As discussed during the personal interview Ito fails to disclose the combination of features recited in amended claim 5, including, inter alia, a first voltage dividing circuit ..., a second voltage dividing circuit ..., a first voltage-follower ..., and a second voltage follower ... driving circuit. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 5 is requested.

Claim 7 has been amended to incorporate the features of original claim 1. Page 4 of the Office Action states that Ito teaches a multi-potential generator that generates five voltages, and that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to replicate the establish dividing scheme to yield seven or more voltages. However, as discussed above and during the

personal interview, Applicant respectfully submits that Ito teaches away from having seven or more driving voltages (col. 4, lines 47-59). Thus, Ito fails to disclose or suggest a power supply circuit with the combination of features recited in claim 7 including, inter alia, a first voltage follower ..., a third step-up circuit ..., a first step-down circuit ..., and a second step-down circuit ... seventh potentials. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 is requested.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent

No. 5,909,146 issued to Okada. The rejection of claim 11 has been rendered moot by the

cancellation of claim 11. However, the features recited in canceled claim 11 are now recited in

amended claim 10. In view of the foregoing, the rejection of claim 10 is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the personal interview, Applicant respectfully submits that Okada fails to disclose or suggest an operational amplifier circuit having the combination of features recited in amended claim 10, wherein . . . gates of transistors having different performances are respectively supplied with the predetermined differential input potential and the potential at the drain of the first or second conductivity type transistor. Page 5 of the Office Action states that Fig. 8 of Okada discloses these features. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Okada fails to disclose the above-identified features because Okada discloses the gates of transistors T2, T1, T6 and/or T5 connected to either IN1 or IN2 and not to the potential at the drain of the transistors T3, T4, T7 and/or T8.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Okada fails to disclose or suggest all the features of amended claim 10. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ito in view of U.S. Patent
No. 5,668,710 issued to Caliboso et al. (hereinafter Caliboso), and claims 8, 9, 12, 13 and



15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ito in view of Okada. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

With regard to claims 3, 4, 8 and 9, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Ito, Caliboso and/or Okada, fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ito as discussed above with regard to claim 1 from which these claims depend. With regard to claims 12, 13 and 15-19, Applicant submits that Ito fails to overcome the deficiencies of Okada as discussed above with regard to amended claim 10, from which these claims depend.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that the combination of Ito, Caliboso and/or Okada, fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 15-19. It is thus respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the rejection of claims 8, 9, 12, 13 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-19 are earnestly solicited.



Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs

Attachments:

Form PTO-1449 filed on January 4, 2002 PTO date-stamped receipt Replacement Sheet for Fig. 2 Amendment Transmittal

Date: May 26, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 19928 Alexandria, Virginia 22320 Telephone: (703) 836-6400 DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461

